

**JS-6**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

**WILLIAM MURRAY, et al.,**

**Plaintiffs,**

**v.**

**RYAN A. NASSBRIDGES,**

**Defendant.**

Case No. SACV08-00472AHS (SSx)  
Hon. Alicemarie H. Stotler

**JUDGMENT**

On December 14, 2009, at 10:00 a.m., Plaintiffs William and Arla Murray's ("Plaintiffs") Motion for Summary Judgment ("Motion") came on for hearing in Courtroom 10A of the above-entitled court, the Honorable Alicemarie H. Stotler presiding. The Motion was originally set for hearing on November 2, 2009, at 10:00 a.m. On October 21, 2009, the Court on its own motion advised Defendant, a pro se litigant, of the requirements of the Local Rules and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, set a new briefing schedule, and continued the hearing on the Motion from November 2, 2009 to December 14, 2009, at 10:00 a.m. (hereafter, "October 21, 2009 order"). (Docket No. 84.)

1 Under Local Rule 7-14, Defendant was required to be present on the hearing  
2 date and “have such familiarity with the case as to permit informed discussion and  
3 argument of the motion.” Failure of a party to appear at a hearing may be deemed  
4 consent to an adverse ruling on that motion. See Local Rule 7-14. Although the  
5 Court called the Motion 10:22 a.m., at least twenty minutes after the originally-  
6 scheduled time, Defendant failed to make an appearance. The Court did not receive  
7 a notice of waiver from Defendant. See Local Rule 7-15. Defendant’s failure to  
8 appear prevented a much needed discussion about the relevance and import of the  
9 purported evidence submitted with Defendant’s opposing papers. Because the Court  
10 specifically advised Defendant of the requirements of the Local Rules and Federal  
11 Rules of Civil Procedure in its October 21, 2009 order, and gave Defendant an extra  
12 six weeks before arguments would be heard on the Motion, the Court deems  
13 Defendant’s failure to appear at the hearing as consent to the granting of Plaintiffs’  
14 Motion.

15 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED  
16 that:

- 17 1. Plaintiffs’ Motion is GRANTED;
- 18 2. Judgment is hereby entered in favor of Plaintiffs William and Arla  
19 Murray and against Defendant Ryan A. Nassbridges in the sum of  
20 \$1,546,523; and
- 21 3. Plaintiffs shall be entitled to costs of suit, if any, as provided by law.

22 Date: December 14, 2009.

23  
24 ALICEMARIE H. STOTLER  
25 ALICEMARIE H. STOTLER  
26 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
27  
28